

1

2

3

4 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

5

6 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

7

8 QUINTARA BIOSCIENCES, INC.,

9 Plaintiff,

10 No. C 20-4808 WHA

11

v.

12 RUIFENG BIZTECH INC., et al.,

13 Defendants.

14 **ORDER RE MOTION FOR
15 PROTECTIVE ORDER AND
16 RE SEALING REQUESTS**

17 A prior order directed plaintiff to disclose its asserted trade secrets before it would be
18 permitted discovery. Plaintiff did so and then served several discovery requests. Defendants
19 again move to halt discovery, rating the disclosure deficient (Dkt. Nos. 40, 50).

20 It is time for the parties to graduate from tee-ball. The prior order barred discovery until
21 plaintiff served a “satisfactory statement” of the asserted trade secrets. If defendants believe
22 the disclosure unsatisfactory, they may refuse discovery and move to strike the trade secret
23 claims. *See, e.g., JobScience, Inc. v. CVPartners, Inc.*, No. C 13-04519 WHA, 2014 WL
24 1724763 (N.D. Cal. May 1, 2014). If they prevail, we may bless their refusal. If plaintiff
25 prevails, we will likely extend discovery.

26 This order also notes that defendants have facially oversealed the instant motion,
27 redacting *every page of the body* of the brief. *Both* parties shall please take a careful look at
28 our local rules and circuit precedent and then reevaluate their *and each other's* requests to seal.

29 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

30 Dated: December 22, 2020.

31 
32 WILLIAM ALSUP
33 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE